

**REMARKS**

In the March 7, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 as unpatentable under 35 USC § 103 and objected to claim 5 as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but containing allowable subject matter.

New claim 7 is herein added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-7 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are respectfully traversed below.

**Rejections under 35 USC § 103**

In item 3 on pages 2-4 of the March 7, 2006 Office Action, claims 1 and 3 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) over Kawakita (International Publication No. WO 99/67067) in view of Klein (US Patent No. 6,064,303). Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the Interview conducted on June 2, 2006. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion during the Interview that the Klein reference shows "detecting a mode of one of the user requests"; instead, what was cited in Klein teaches dialing a phone number based on a type of user distress.

Claim 1 as amended recites "a storing section which stores telephone numbers respectively associated with priority sequences, designation modes and messages" (claim 1, lines 5-6). It was admitted in the Office Action that Kawakita "does not teach a plurality of messages respectively associated with the plurality of telephone numbers" (Office Action, page 3, lines 14-15). Next it was alleged that Klein teaches "a system with a plurality of messages associated with a plurality of telephone numbers (Fig. 6, item 604, telephone #)" (Office Action, page 3, lines 20-22).

What was cited in Klein was a remedy table illustrated in Fig. 6 that has "columns for the character string representation of a diagnosis 602, for the key or type of the diagnosis 603 corresponding to one of the diagnosis keys stored in column 502 in table 501, for a telephone number 604, for a type of receiver 605, and for a message 606" (Klein, column 7, lines 33-38). In the table cited in Klein, a "DIAGNOSIS" column lists types of distress events, such as intruder, fire, vandalism and teenage party distress. As indicated by the use of the term "diagnosis," Klein discloses a system that uses inputs from sensors, such as microphones or video cameras, to make a diagnosis of the types of distress events. This is significantly different than the robot recited in claim 1, where in response to detection of one of the "designation modes" (claim 1, line 6) in "user requests provided by a user" (claim 1, line 4), the telephone control section

"delivers an associated message" (claim 1, line 10). For example, in the embodiment disclosed at page 14, lines 2-13 of the application, a coded signal is detected based on whether "the user presses the button 104 once [for a period of time shorter than a predetermined time length], ... twice, ... [or] once for a time longer than the predetermined time length ..." (page 14, lines 6-12). There is no suggestion in the "diagnosis" performed by the system disclosed in Klein of detecting the code or "designation mode" in a user request, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it was admitted in the Office Action that Kawakita "does not teach ... the telephone control section dialing a telephone number according to a mode of request detected by the detection section, and delivering a message associated with the dialed telephone number" (Office Action, page 3, lines 14-17). Next it was alleged that Klein teaches "a system ... dialing a telephone number according to a mode of request (Fig. 6, item 602, intruder, fire, vandalism etc.) and delivering a voice message associated with dialed telephone number (Fig. 6, item 606, message, .wav files)" (Office Action, page 3, line 18 to page 4, line 2).

What was cited in Klein referring to FIG. 6, describes:

the telephone number 392-4566 should be called by the home security system when an 'intruder' diagnosis has been made by the home security system, that a voice-type message should be transmitted to this telephone number, and that the voice-type message is contained in the file 'intrdr.wav." Thus, entry 607 in the diagnosis table indicates to the remedy step that if the sequence of events corresponding to a diagnosis type of '1' has been found in the detected event tables of FIG. 4, then the most likely diagnosis is that an intruder has entered the house

(Klein, column 7, lines 41-51). It is important to note that one of the differences between the present invention and what is described in Klein is that the system in Klein makes the diagnosis of the type of distress event as opposed to "detecting a mode of one of the user requests" (claim 1, lines 10-11) that is "associated with priority sequences, ... messages" (claim 1, line 6) and "telephone numbers" (claim 1, line 5). It should be clear that the intruder making the sounds detected by the sensors of a system as described in Klein cannot be equated with "a user" (claim 1, line 4), because in no way does an intruder submit "user requests" (claim 1, line 10) to the system.

Nothing was cited or found in Kawakita and Klein either considered together or taken individually that teaches or suggests the limitations discussed above that are recited in claim 1. Thus, for all the reasons presented above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claim 3 depends from claim 1 and distinguishes over the applied art for the reasons discussed in regard to claim 1.

In Item 4 on page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawakita and Klein and further in view of Dahlen (US Patent 5,870,454) and in item 5 on page 5 of the Office Action, dependent claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawakita and Klein and further in view of Kataoka (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0181723). Dependent claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and distinguish over Kawakita and Klein for the reasons discussed in regard to claim 1. Nothing was cited or found in Dahlen or Kataoka suggesting modification of Kawakita and Klein to overcome the deficiencies thereof relative to claim 1 that were discussed above.

### New Claim

Newly added claim 7 depends from claim 1 and adds that the associated message is delivered based on one of the priority sequences. Thus, claim 7 distinguishes over the applied art for the reasons discussed in regard to claim 1 and further distinguishes over the applied art due to the additional limitation recited therein.

### CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the cited references taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7, in addition to claim 5, are in condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6/7/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on JUNE 7, 2006  
STAAS & HALSEY  
By: John L. Halsey  
Date: JUNE 7, 2006